

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed on March 12, 2003. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application with Claims 1 and 6 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1 and 6 have been amended in a manner believed to better clarify Applicants' claimed invention. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,866,265 issued to Reilly et al. ("Reilly et al.").

The amended Claim 1 recites: "A method of manufacturing a grid structure with regions exhibiting different X-ray related properties, wherein the method comprises the steps of: extruding material strips exhibiting different X-ray transmissivities so as to form the regions of said grid structure, wherein said regions alternate between materials having high X-ray transmissivity and materials having low X-ray transmissivity; and allowing at least one of the extruded material strips to expand in at least one direction such that at least one dimension of the at least one of the extruded material strips prior to extrusion is restored" (emphasis added). Claim 6 includes similar language as the language added to Claim 1.

Reilly et al. disclose a method of manufacturing a grid structure fabricated from rubber compounds having different, abrasion resistance properties in order to produce a

rubber article having a surface designed for high abrasion resistance. Reilly et al. do not disclose or suggest the use of materials and compounds with X-ray related properties including X-ray transmissivity, in fact, no materials other than rubber compounds are disclosed. One skilled in the art of manufacturing grid structures having regions exhibiting different X-ray transmissivities, where the regions alternate between materials having high X-ray transmissivity and materials having low X-ray transmissivity, will not look to the disclosure of Reilly et al. Therefore, it is believed that Claim 1 (as well as Claim 6) is patentably distinct over the prior art reference and accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from independent Claims 1 and 6 and thus are limited by the language recited by these independent claims. Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above for Claim 1 and 6, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 3 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,592 issued to Zarnoch et al. ("Zarnoch et al.").

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent Claim 1 and thus are limited by the language recited by this independent claim. Further, Reilly et al. do not disclose or

suggest applying the method of manufacture to any application other than to rubber articles designed for high abrasion resistance. While Zarnoch et al. disclose an anti-scatter grid device fabricated from a material having high X-ray transmissivity that is subsequently scored with grooves spaced at desired intervals and filled with a material having low X-ray transmissivity, thereby creating a grid structure with alternating transmissivity, an extrusion fabrication process, however, is not disclosed or suggested. Therefore, the combination of these cited references is not appropriate, since the cited references teach towards very different fields of endeavor and thus, one skilled in one referenced art, would not necessarily be or even expected to be skilled in the other art. Consequently, the combination cited would not be obvious to one skilled in either art. Further, there is no suggestion in either reference to combine the two references. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Claims 3 and 4 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art references and accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. in view of Zarnoch et al. and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. and Zarnoch et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,919,559 issued to Stevens ("Stevens").

Claim 5 depends from independent Claim 1 and thus is limited by the language recited by this independent claim. Claim 6, as stated previously, recites similar language as Claim 1. Therefore, the reasons given above for Claim 1 as well as the reasons given

above for Claims 3 and 4 regarding the Reilly et al.-Zarnoch et al. combination apply to Claim 6 as well.


While Stevens discloses producing a louvered grid structure, Stevens does not overcome the deficiencies of Reilly et al. and Zarnoch et al. regarding applying extrusion fabrication processes to the production of X-ray grid structures having regions of different X-ray transmissivities. In fact, Stevens is silent on the method used to produce the X-ray grid structure and only discloses the method of forming the louvered configuration from an existing grid structure. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Claims 5 and 6 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Reilly et al. and Zarnoch et al. in view of Stevens and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-7, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call John Vodopia, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-333-9627.

Respectfully submitted,



George Likourezos

Reg. No. 40,067

Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
Corporate Patent Counsel
U.S. Philips Corporation
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, New York 10591